

Serial No. 10/606,333 16
Docket No. C14-159454M/TRK
(NGB.261)

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-17, 19-26, and 28-38 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. Applicants have canceled claims 5, 18, and 27 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants have amended claims 1, 17, and 26 to define the claimed invention more particularly.

Applicants believe that entry of the claim amendments is proper since the amendments do not raise new issues, which would require further consideration and/or search.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicants specifically state that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14-16, and 35-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunn, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0210402; hereinafter "Gunn") in view of Comerford, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,963,671; hereinafter "Comerford"). Claims 3, 4, 13, 17, 21-26, and 30-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunn in view of Comerford and Do (U.S. Patent No. 6,417,869). Claims 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunn in view of Comerford and Cirne (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,763). Claims 9, 10, 18-20, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunn in view of Comerford, Do, and Cirne.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

An exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention, as defined by, for example, independent claim 1, is directed to a display control device that includes a display control section adapted to display a plurality of button groups each having at least one button in a monitor connected thereto and to display any of the buttons displayed in the monitor in focused state, and a button change section including an in-group button changing operation unit adapted to change the button to be focused from one button to another within the button group, and an inter-group button changing operation unit adapted to change the button to be focused from a button of one button group to a button of another button group. When the button to be focused is changed by the inter-group button changing operation unit from the button of one button group to the button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state.

Furthermore, the display control section includes a button memory unit adapted to memorize a button that was focused immediately before the button to be focused is changed by the inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of one button group to a button of another button group. When the button to be focused is changed by the inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of the another button group to a button of the one button group, the display control section displays the button memorized in the button memory unit in focused state.

In this manner, the operation of the display may be comprehended easily and quickly.

Serial No. 10/606,333 18
Docket No. C14-159454M/TRK
(NGB.261)

II. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES

Applicants have amended the claims to incorporate the subject matter of claims 5, 18, and 27 into independent claims 1, 17, and 26, respectively.

In rejecting, for example, claim 5, the Examiner alleges that Cime teaches "saving a current focus item in a group window, so that when the dialog returns to the window the focus can be directed to the same item." (See Office Action dated September 4, 2008 at page 17). The Examiner further alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the combined teachings of Gunn and Comerford to include the saving feature of Cime "because this allows for directing a focus to the same item when a group window is reopened." (See Office Action dated September 4, 2008 at page 18).

Applicants, however, submit that the combination of Gunn and Cime is unreasonable.

Gunn teaches, in paragraph [0010], changing the current focus within a button group. Furthermore, Gunn discloses, in paragraphs [0125] and [0128], changing button groups and further changing the focus of the most likely button in the changed-to button group. Finally, Gunn discloses, in paragraphs [0125] and [0128], and in Figures 10-12, the most commonly used character (as predetermined by previous usage) will be displayed in or near the center of a character set grouping that is user selectable.

It is not clear, from the Examiner's rejection, which feature of Gunn the Examiner is referring to as the focused state. It appears that the focused state in Gunn is merely a state in which a cursor is displayed on a button.

In this case, in Gunn, since the purpose of providing the most commonly used character at a center is to reduce the movement of the cursor (see Gunn at paragraph [0166]), it is not helpful to focus the button, which is focused immediately before the button to be

Serial No. 10/606,333 19
Docket No. C14-159454M/TRK
(NGB.261)

focused by the inter-group button changing operation when back to the display of the previous button group.

Therefore, there is no reasonable rationale for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the saving feature of Cirne with the teachings of Gunn (alone or as modified by the other applied references).

Moreover, the Examiner alleges that Gunn discloses changing character configurations presented to the user based upon the likelihood of a selection where the location is modified to highlight specific characters. According to this assertion, it appears that the Examiner understands that the focused state refers to a state in which a button is provided at a center based on a likelihood of use.

In this case, in Gunn, since the purpose of updating the character configuration is to reflect a likelihood of character selection, it is not helpful to focus the button that is focused immediately before the button to be focused by the inter-group changing operation when back to display a previous button group. This is because the likelihood of a selection is changed before returning to the display of the previous button group.

Therefore, there is no reasonable rationale for one of ordinary skill in the art to combined the saving feature of Cirne with the teachings of Gunn (alone or as modified by the other applied references).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw each of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Serial No. 10/606,333 20
Docket No. C14-159454M/TRK
(NGB.261)

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-4, 6-17, 19-26, and 28-38, all of the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, Applicants request the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Date: December 4, 2008

Respectfully Submitted,


Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Registration No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386


**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC**
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that I am filing this paper via facsimile, to Group Art Unit 2173, at (571) 273-8300, on December 4, 2008.

Date: December 4, 2008

Respectfully Submitted,


Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Reg. No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Reg. No. 34,386